

### ***REMARKS***

Claims 21-22, 24-33, and 35-40 been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,532,218 to Shaffer et al. ("Shaffer") in view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0117426 to Rudkin. Claims 21, 32 and 40 are presented in independent form.

Claims 21, 32, and 40 have been amended to more accurately define Applicants' invention. Specifically, independent claims 21, 32, and 40 now require that the video server make a determination as to authentication and security authorization of each requesting remote computer prior to the transmission of video from the video server via a first encryption technique and that the transmitted video signal and data signal be encrypted and decrypted via a second encryption technique. Support for such an amendment may be found at least at page 26 to 27 of the specification.

Claim 21 discloses a video conferencing system comprising a video server having a specific internet address and a video input port for receiving a source video signal appearing on a video output port of an initiating computer. The video server transforms the source video signal into a video server output signal having a format suitable for communication over the Internet. The system further comprises a plurality of remote computers, where each of the remote computers executes its own respective browser application to allow it to access the video server via the specific Internet address associated with the video server.

The video server downloading the video server output signal to each of the remote computers upon its respective access to the video server, wherein access by the remote computer is verified by a first encryption technique that requires confirmation by the video server of authentication and security authorization information entered at the remote computer and

wherein the video server output signals themselves are encrypted by a second encryption technique,

Further, each of the remote computers decrypts via the second encryption technique and transforms the downloaded video server output signal into a display signal suitable for viewing on a display device associated with that remote computer, and where a representation of the source video signal at the initiating computer is viewable on each of the plurality of remote computers.

As presently amended, Claim 21 requires that encryption techniques are used both to verify the identity of the remote participant and to encrypt and decrypt the transmitted video and data signals. Additionally, the verification of the user and the encryption of the video and data signals are accomplished using two different encryption techniques. By way of example only, a 128-bit public key RSA encryption technique may be used to verify the remote participant, and a 128-bit RC4 private key encryption and decryption technique may be used to encrypt and decrypt the transmitted video signals. Of course other acceptable encryption and decryption techniques are available.

Contrastingly, neither Schaffer nor Rudkin teach a system that utilizes two different encryption techniques used both to verify the identity of the remote participant and to encrypt and decrypt the transmitted video and data signals. While Rudkin may teach a user authentication technique, it fails to teach the use of one encryption technique for access and a second technique for data encryption. As stated in paragraph 72 of Rudkin, teaches

The web server program controls the Web server computer 102 send web-pages requested by a user to that user and to gather information about users in order to enable personalisation of the user's service. In the present embodiment, this is achieved by asking users to fill in a HyperText Mark Up Language (HTML) form in order to register with the web-site. The form asks the user for a user name and password and various other data such as the user's age, gender, nationality and

occupation category. The information from all registered users is stored as a database at the Web server computer 102, the database comprising a number of user records, each being of the form shown in FIG. 2.

However, nothing in Rudkin teaches encrypting and decrypting the transmitted video signals utilizing a second encryption technique.

For at least these reasons, it is believed clear that independent Claim 21 is allowable over Shaffer and Rudkin. Independent claims 32 and 40 contain similar limitations as those recited in Claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 32 and 40 are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 21.

The remaining claims all depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case maybe, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application. If, however, there are any unresolved issues, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' representative via telephone so that such issues can be quickly resolved.


### *Correspondence and Fees*

Concurrently herewith, Applicants have filed a petition for a three month extension and paid the applicable \$1110.00 fee. No additional fees are believed to be necessitated by the

instant response. However, should a fee be required, authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account no. 03-3839 for any underpayment, or to credit any overpayments.

Please address all correspondence to the correspondent address for **Customer No. 26345 of Intellectual Docket Administrator, Gibbons P.C.**, One Gateway Center, Newark, NJ 07102-5310. Telephone calls should be made to Andrew M. Grodin at (973) 596-4553 and fax communications should be sent directly to him at (973) 639-8355.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'AM Grodin', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Andrew M. Grodin  
Registration No. 50,728  
Attorney for Applicants

Gibbons P.C.  
One Gateway Center  
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5310